UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/824,954	04/03/2001	Jose Luis Montero Real	60001.0042US01	1571

27488	7590	07/05/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
CHANG, ERIC

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2116	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/824,954	REAL, JOSE LUIS MONTERO
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Eric Chang	2116	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 June 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-10,13-20,26 and 27</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-10,13-20,26 and 27</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-10, 13-20 and 26-27 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

3.   Claims 1-6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent 6,396,515 to Hetherington et al., in view of U.S. Patent 6,697,089 to Bryan.

4.   As to claim 1, Hetherington discloses a method for booting an application program

running over an operating system on a computer, wherein the application program and operating

system support a plurality of editing languages, the method comprising the steps of: booting the

application program [col. 2, lines 42-45]; and setting a plurality of default language settings of

the application program to be equal to a user interface language of the operating system [col. 2,

lines 42-51]. Hetherington teaches basing the default language settings of the application

program based on a language property for the host data processing system [FIG. 2B, element

214].

Hetherington teaches the limitations of the claim, including setting the language when the

application program is executed, but does not specifically teach determining if it is the first boot

of the application module in order to set the language.

Bryan teaches a computer system that allows users to use different user interface language options for their software [col. 2, lines 55-61]. Thus, Bryan teaches a computer system that supports different language options, similar to that of Hetherington. Bryan further teaches determining if it is the first boot of the application module in order to set the language [col. 4, lines 45-54].

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to employ the configuration at the initial loading of the application program as taught by Bryan. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so that the software would be configured correctly for subsequent loadings of the application program.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the cited references because they are both directed to the problem of configuring the user-interface language of an application program. Moreover, the configuration during the initial loading means taught by Bryan would improve the flexibility of Hetherington because it allowed the user to set grammar and semantic options in addition to a language option [col. 2, lines 55-61].

5.   As to claims 2-6, Hetherington discloses the plurality of default language settings comprise an install language of the application program, a Web locale language of the application program, a help language of the application program and a user interface language of the application program [col. 3, lines 59-67, and col. 4, lines 1-8]. Hetherington teaches the

language settings are applied to all user interface text and user-interface components, such as

install dialog box language, help text, and the like.

6.   As to claim 26, Bryan teaches that the default language settings are set in response to any

number of selection parameters at the time of first boot of the application [col. 4, lines 36-58],

such as a registry key.

7.   Claims 7-10, 13-20 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over U.S. Patent 6,396,515 to Hetherington et al., in view of U.S. Patent 6,697,089 to Bryan, and

in further view of U.S. Patent 6,014,616 to Kim.

8.   As to claims 7-10, Hetherington and Bryan teach the limitations of the claim, but do not

teach enabling an editing language for the application program based on an IME.

Kim teaches that the editing language for an application program may be set by an input

locale, such as a keyboard, light pen, or the like [col. 4, lines 25-34], and determining an applied

language while the application is running, and enabling the determined language therefrom [col.

4, lines 47-52]. Kim also teaches that this setting occurs based on an IME, or the like [col. 1,

lines 38-47]. It would further be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that other detection of

an enabled language, such as an operating system or script setting could also be used to set the

editing language of the application [col. 4, lines 1-3], substantially as claimed.

At the time that the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to employ the editing language enabling means as taught by Kim. One of

ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so that the editing language for the application could be automatically set, in addition to the user interface language.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of the cited references because they are both directed to the problem of selecting the user language of an application from a plurality of available languages. Moreover, the editing language enabling means taught by Kim would improve the flexibility of Hetherington and Bryan because it allowed for a visual representation of the active editing language, in addition to the dynamic selection of said language based on an input locale.

9.   As to claim 13, Hetherington and Bryan teach a method for booting an application program running over an operating system on a computer, wherein the application program and operating system support a plurality of editing languages, the method comprising the steps of: booting the application program [col. 2, lines 42-45]; and setting a plurality of default language settings of the application program to be equal to a user interface language of the operating system [col. 2, lines 42-51]. Kim teaches enabling at least one editing language for a plurality of keyboards, IMEs and AIMEs, input locales, or operating system settings installed on the computer [col. 4, lines 1-3, 25-34 and 47-52], substantially as claimed.

10.   As to claims 14-15, Kim discloses the input locale comprises software that allows text to be input [col. 1, lines 38-47], and that the input locale adjusts the properties of a keyboard, such as the layout, accordingly.

11.   As to claim 16, Hetherington discloses the operating system script comprises a set of files that enable support in the operating system for that language [col. 3, lines 59-67].

12.   As to claim 17, Kim discloses determining whether a language has been applied within the application program and, if so, then enabling an editing language associated with the applied language [col. 1, lines 38-47]. Kim teaches enabling the appropriate editing language for an application program based on the applied language settings.

13.   As to claim 18, Kim discloses the step of determining whether a language has been applied within the application program comprises determining whether a language associated with an insertion point within the application program is a language that has not been enabled [col. 4, lines 47-52]. Kim teaches determining the language for the application program when the user changes the language settings at an insertion point by selecting a new language from the keyboard.

14.   As to claim 19, Heatherington, Bryan and Kim teach all of the limitations of the claim. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust the value of a plurality of registry keys associated with the plurality of editing languages, because many operating system settings, such as enabled languages, are stored within the registry, substantially as claimed.

15.   As to claim 20, Hetherington, Bryan and Kim teach the method for setting the language

settings for an application program, substantially as claimed. Because Hetherington, Bryan and

Kim teach the method, they teach a computer-readable medium comprising computer-readable

instructions for performing the method.

16.   As to claim 27, Bryan teaches that the default language settings are set in response to any

number of selection parameters at the time of first boot of the application [col. 4, lines 36-58],

such as a registry key.

Response to Arguments

17.   Applicant's arguments, see page 2, paragraph 3, filed June 3, 2005, with respect to claim

1 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1-10, 13-20 and 26-27

have been withdrawn.

Conclusion

18.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Eric Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3671. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Lynne Browne can be reached on (571) 272-3670. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

June 16, 2005
ec

LYNNE H. BROWNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100